



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,372	11/15/2000	Leo Hatjasalo	1625/00032	6224

7590 06/13/2003

Burton A Amernick  
Pollock Vande Sande & Amernick  
PO Box 19088  
Washington, DC 20036-3425

EXAMINER

STAIKOVICI, STEFAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

12

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No. 09/700,372	Applicant(s) HATJASALO ET AL.	
Examiner Stefan Staicovici	Art Unit 1732	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See attachment.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-10,13,15,17-19,21 and 22.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: See attachment

## **ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed June 5, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because it lacks a statement as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Response to After-Final Amendment***

2. Applicants' After-Final amendment filed May 28, 2003 (Paper No. 11) will not be entered because, the proposed amendments raise new issues that would require further consideration and a new search and also, because the proposed amendments are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Specifically, in independent claims 1 and 8, the newly added limitation of a "mould, which is not grounded" has not been previously presented and as such would require further consideration and a new search. Further, in independent claim 1, by incorporating the limitation "... wherein the material (1) is a multi-component polymer-based material comprising ingredients (1a, 1b) that are individually heated by a heating unit and mixed together", subject matter has been introduced in a combination which has not been previously presented and as such would require further consideration.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's remarks filed May 28, 2003 (Paper No. 11) have been considered.

Art Unit: 1732

Applicants argue that the art of record does not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, a method for making a thin-walled article “using a mould that is not earthed or grounded” (see pages 2-4 of the After-Final amendment filed May 28, 2003). However, this argument is drawn to a newly presented claim limitation not previously presented and as such would require further consideration and a new search.

Applicants argue that the mold of Itoh ('031) “cannot be set at different voltage levels” (see page 3 of the After-Final amendment filed May 28, 2003). However, in response it should be noted that an electrical voltage is defined between two surfaces set at different electrical potentials and as such the substrate (10) of Itoh ('031) has a surface set at different voltages because the *difference in potential* (i.e., voltage) between said substrate (10) and mold (2) (electrode) varies along the surface of said substrate (10).

Applicants argue that the art of record does not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, a method for making a thin-walled article from a material such that “the material (1) is a multi-component polymer-based material comprising ingredients (1a, 1b) that are individually heated by a heating unit and mixed together” (see page 4 of the After-Final amendment filed May 28, 2003). However, this argument is drawn to subject matter in a combination that has not been previously presented and as such would require further consideration. Further, it should be noted that as presented throughout prosecution of the instant application, Panandiker et al. ('550) teach a polyurethane based composition (col. 3, line 19) used in an electrostatic spraying process (col. 1, line 18) including, providing a first component (polyol and blocking agent) and a second component (polyisocyanate), heating each component

Art Unit: 1732

and then mixing said components under heat in order to provide a composition to be used in an electrostatic spraying process (see col. 4, line 20 through col. 5, line 15 and Example 1).

*Conclusion*

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefan Staicovici, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0396. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM and alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard D. Crispino, can be reached at (703) 308-3853. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Stefan Staicovici, PhD



Primary Examiner

6/11/03

AU 1732

June 11, 2003